

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 09/757,778 01/09/01 KOYAMA J 07977/108002 **EXAMINER** MM21/0925 SCOTT C. HARRIS **DUONG.T** FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. **ART UNIT** PAPER NUMBER SUITE 500 4350 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE 2871 SAN DIEGO CA 92122 DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

09/25/01

## Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/757,778

Applicant(s)

KOYAMA ET AI.

Examiner

TAI DUONG

Art Unit **2871** 

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
Period for Reply	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	
communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the	eation.
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	
	tion is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pa	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is arte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims	
4) X Claim(s) <u>1-43</u>	is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) 💢 Claim(s) 1-43	is/are rejected.
7)	is/are objected to.
8) Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Application Papers  9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) The drawing(s) filed on	$2/01$ is: a) approved b) $\square$ disapproved.
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	mer.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  13)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p  a)  All b)  Some* c) None of:  1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have  2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have	ve been received.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority of application from the International Bure *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the second control of the certified copies of the priority of the	
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	
Attachment(s)	
15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
16] Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19] Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
17) X Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 3	20) Other:

Page 2

Art Unit: 2871

The proposed drawing correction filed on 2/12/01 has been approved.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ormum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-44 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-37 of U.S. Patent No. 6,246,454. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims omit some of the recited elements and the recited steps from the claims of the above patent, e.g. the counter substrate, the liquid crystal layer, the sealant material, the step of performing a rubbing operation, the step of printing a sealant material, and the step of bonding together the TFT substrate and the counter substrate. Such omission would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art when the functions provided by these elements and these steps are not desired in the device and the method of fabricating such device. See *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ 2031 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989); *In re Larson*, 340 F.2d 965, 144 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1965), and *In re Kuhle*, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975). It is noted that the scope of

Application/Control Number: 09/757,778 Page 3

Art Unit: 2871

the instant claims is broader than that of the claims of the patent due to the elimination of a step or an element from the patent claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Tai Duong at telephone number (703) 308-4873.

TVD

09/10/01

KENNETH PARKEH PRIMARY EXAMINER